

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-34 were pending in the present application. Claims 2, 15-16, 21, and 28-33 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-5, 13, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 34 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-14, 17-20, 22-27, and 34 are now pending in the application.

Claims 4-14, and 30-34 are objected to for informalities. Applicant has corrected the typographic errors in claims 4, 5, 13, and 34 and cancelled claim 30.

Claims 15 and 16 stood rejected under U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. While Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, Applicant has nevertheless cancelled claims 15-16. The rejection is thus believed moot.

Claims 1, 2, 15-20, 24, 25, and 27 stand rejected under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Singhal, et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,978,874) (hereinafter “Singhal”). Although Applicant respectfully traverses at least portions of this rejection, to expedite allowance, Applicant has amended various independent claims to include features previously recited in dependent claims such claims 20 and 21, for example. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in light of the foregoing amendments.

Claims 1-14, 19, 26, and 28-34 stand rejected under U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gharachorloo, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0124144) (hereinafter “Gharachorloo”). Although Applicant respectfully traverses at least portions of this rejection, to expedite allowance, Applicant has amended various independent claims to include features previously recited in dependent claims such as claims 20 and 21, for example. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in light of the foregoing amendments.

The Examiner indicated claims 21-23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As described above, Applicant has amended claims 1, 19, and 34 to include features that were previously included independent claims such as claim 20 and/or claim 21, for example.

More particularly, Applicant's claim 1, as amended, recites in pertinent part

“wherein as part of a coherency transaction involving a coherency unit cached by the processing subsystem, the processing subsystem is configured to transition an access right to the coherency unit in response to the processing subsystem receiving a data packet via the data network, and to transition an ownership responsibility for the coherency unit in response to an address packet on the address network, wherein the processing subsystem transitions the access right at a different time than the processing subsystem transitions the ownership responsibility;  
wherein the address packet and the data packet are part of a transaction initiated by the processing subsystem; and  
wherein the interface in the node is configured to delay providing the data packet on the data network until the interface receives an indication that shared copies of the coherency unit in the additional node have been invalidated.”

Claims 21 and 34 recite similar features. Applicant submits these features are not taught or suggested in the cited art. Indeed, the Examiner acknowledged that the combination of features recited in Applicant's claims 20 and 21 were not taught or suggested in either Singhal or Gharachorloo. Accordingly, in view of the amendments, Applicant submits claims 1, 19, and 34, along with their respective dependent claims patentably distinguish over Singhal and Gharachorloo.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-00201.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Stephen J. Curran /  
 Stephen J. Curran  
 Reg. No. 50,664  
 AGENT FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzal, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: July 6, 2007